



City of Norfolk's 2014 Legislative Priorities

-Approved by Norfolk City Council on November 26, 2013-

2014 Federal Priorities

1. Flood Control/Water Infrastructure: Pursue funding and partnership to address flood control and water infrastructure priorities. Support the completion of on-going federal flood control studies.
 - City of Norfolk Comprehensive Flood Control Study
 - Section 205 Flood Mitigation Studies
 - Willoughby Spit and Vicinity Beach Nourishment Implementation
 - Western Branch Dam Upgrades
 - Wastewater System Upgrades
2. Transportation: Pursue federal transportation funding and partnership to address mobility on-going transportation priorities.
 - Advance federal Environmental Impact Statement on the Richmond to Hampton Roads Passenger Rail Corridor Study
 - Facilitate enhanced federal bicycle / pedestrian trail support
3. Disaster Preparedness: Pursue federal funding and partnership to address Norfolk's disproportionate homeland security and disaster preparedness challenges.
 - Dept. of Homeland Security Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI)
4. Education: Pursue federal funding and partnership for closing the achievement gap and improve safety and security at Norfolk Public Schools.
5. Veterans / Homeless: Pursue grant funding and programmatic housing funding and partnership with on-going veteran workforce development programs and homelessness assistance.
6. Municipal Finance: Oppose legislative efforts to remove or limit federal tax exemption of municipal bonds and other related municipal debt instruments.

2014 Federal Grant Priorities

1. Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Grant
2. Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grant
3. Federal Emergency Management Agency's: Pre-disaster Mitigation, Fire and Emergency Response, and Emergency Operations Center Grants
4. Dept. of Justice Community Oriented Policing Services Grants
5. Dept. of Education Race to the Top
6. Investing in Innovation (i3)
7. Promise Neighborhoods

2014 Virginia General Assembly Budget Amendment Requests

The City of Norfolk respectfully requests the General Assembly to consider the following budget amendments:

1. Provide sufficient funding supporting for a two (2) year General Assembly Joint Study Committee to further investigate and make recommendations on recurrent flooding in Virginia.
2. Appropriate full funding of the Virginia Port Payment in Lieu of Taxes funding formula.
3. Appropriate full funding of the Norfolk Light Rail Extension to the Naval Station Norfolk Draft Environmental Impact Study (approximately \$7 million).

2014 Virginia General Assembly Legislative Requests

Legislative Request # 1: The City of Norfolk requests the General Assembly to establish and fund a Joint Study Committee to further investigate and make recommendations on recurrent flooding in Virginia

The 2012 General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia unanimously passed [SJR 76, 2012: Recurrent Flooding Study of Tidewater Virginia](#) and commissioned a study to evaluate Virginia's coastal communities' current capabilities to identify and implement comprehensive adaptation strategies to mitigate recurrent flooding. The study was conducted by the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences (VIMS) and published as Senate Document No.3 January 2013 (VIMS Report).

The VIMS Report concludes Virginia localities are not adequately equipped to address and implement meaningful flood mitigation strategies required for responding to predicated relative sea level rise on their own. Within the VIMS Report, there are a series of simulations that show impacted areas as influenced by: a) storm surge, b) sea level rise, and c) the recurrences of storms making land fall within the region. All of these factors both individually and collectively, are anticipated to increase the frequency and the severity of recurrent flooding events. This will increase damages to public and private property, amplify impacts to public safety, and increase disruption to individuals and the economy. Left unaddressed, the Commonwealth can reasonably anticipate that it will see significant and profound recurrent flooding now and into the immediate planning horizon.

This contention supported by the VIMS Expert Advisory Panel is that Virginia localities are overwhelmed by the magnitude of the recurrent flooding challenges and do not have sufficient technical resources to define and address the recurrent flooding risks. Further, Virginia local

governments lack the framework and structure for responding to and planning for future significant recurrent coastal flooding events, and not have the financial resources or regulation authority to implement necessary comprehensive flood mitigation solutions.

To mitigate these shortfalls, the VIMS report recommends that the state take a stronger leadership role to incorporate flood and sea level rise management into their purview. It also recommends the state take ownership of the necessary integration role between the localities and the appropriate federal agencies.

To further advance the VIMS report recommendations, the City of Norfolk requests the General Assembly establish and fund a two-year (2) Joint Study Committee to further investigate and make recommendations on recurrent flooding in Virginia.

Legislative Request # 2: The City of Norfolk requests the General Assembly increase the term of Norfolk school board member appointments from two (2) years to (3) years.

Currently, there are 23 Virginia local governments with an appointed school board. The large majority of which appoint their respective school board members for a three year or in some cases a four-year term. Norfolk is the only school board in the Commonwealth that is limited by statute to a school board appointment term of two-years. The Norfolk City Council requests the General Assembly provide similar authority and increase the term of its School Board members from two-years to three-years.

Legislative Request # 3: The City of Norfolk requests the General Assembly to approve three City Charter amendments regarding the schedule of Council meetings and the creation of one unclassified deputy chief of police position.

Modification of Council meeting schedule:

The Norfolk City Council is statutorily required to meet a minimum of 36 times per calendar year. In the Hampton Roads region, the cities of Virginia Beach, Chesapeake, Hampton, and Newport News Councils are only statutorily required to meet a minimum once a month. The same is true for most local government councils across the Commonwealth with local government councils deciding their public meeting schedule and organization of work committees by ordinance or resolution.

The Norfolk City Council requests the General Assembly reduce its statutorily required 36 Council meetings per calendar year to one council meeting per month as typically required of most Virginia local government councils.

Deputy Chief of Police:

The Norfolk City Council requests the General Assembly to amend its City Charter to create one new unclassified deputy chief of police position reporting directly to the chief of police.

City of Norfolk's 2014 Virginia General Assembly Legislative Priorities

Legislative Priority # 1: The City of Norfolk strongly opposes the elimination of the existing legislative moratorium on uranium mining in Virginia. (Council Priorities: *Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Environmental Sustainability; and Safe, Healthy and Inclusive Community*).

Virginia Uranium, Inc. has proposed to conduct mining of uranium deposits on its Coles Hill property in Pittsylvania County, Virginia. Before any mining can occur, the Commonwealth must lift a statutory moratorium on uranium mining that has been in effect statewide for several decades. Virginia Uranium pursued an aggressive legislation initiative during the 2013 General Assembly, which was ultimately withdrawn by its primary patron to avoid a record of General Assembly defeat. It continues to pursue intensive grassroots and legislative efforts to lift the existing statutory moratorium.

Norfolk's opposition to the lifting of the moratorium on uranium mining in Virginia is predicated on the city's informed conclusion that the existing environmental and public health regulatory structure for traditional mining operations in the Commonwealth is fundamentally flawed.

To be effective, this new regulatory framework will be extremely complicated, as compared to Virginia's current mining regulatory structure. Uranium is found in the ground in nature but when exposed to air and water during the mining process, radiation is released into the environment. Uranium mining is a completely new and unfamiliar mining industry to the Commonwealth and has only been mined in remote, arid areas. Further, there is no evidence to suggest conclusively that mining uranium in a wet climate can be done safely.

The venue for testing a new experimental regulatory structure and new uranium mining technology in a precipitous climate like Virginia should not occur when the consequences of error would be catastrophic to such a vital and important water supply serving more than 1 million people in Southside Virginia as well as the world's largest naval base.

Legislative Priority # 2: The City of Norfolk strongly opposes the enactment of the Opportunity Education Institute. (Council Priorities: *Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; and Well-Managed Government*).

Beginning with the 2014-14 school year, the state Opportunity Educational Institution (OEI), a statewide school division, will take over the operation of identified local public school that have been denied accreditation. OEI is patterned after similar school takeover initiatives in both Louisiana and Tennessee. The OEI will be governed by four legislators appointed by the General Assembly and five citizens plus OEI's executive director being appointed by the Governor.

Under the provisions of this legislation, beginning fall 2014, the OEI shall take over any Virginia public school denied accreditation (Virginia Code 22.1-27.2(B)). The OEI Board may elect to transfer schools that are accredited with warning for three consecutive years. However there are no provisions governing what happens should the schools under the OEI continue to be low-performing.

OEI legislation specifies that all applicable state and local education funding associated with a student in a school operated by OEI will be transferred to OEI. This includes local discretionary or “aspirational” funding that exceeds the required local share with no guarantees these dollars would be spent on local students. The legislation also further states that the OEI will have the right to use any school building and all facilities and property of the school. OEI would be responsible for routine maintenance but the locality “shall” provide “extensive repairs.”

There are significant constitutional questions regarding the legality of the creation and operation of a statewide school board as proposed. The Norfolk School Board has challenged the constitutionality of OEI and filed a complaint in Norfolk Circuit Court that will likely be heard by the Virginia Supreme Court. Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli has also stated publicly that he does not believe OEI is constitutional.

The Norfolk City Council feels OEI is unconstitutional and requests the General Assembly to repeal its enabling legislation. However, if repeal of OEI is not possible, the Norfolk City Council then requests the General Assembly to delay its enactment for one year so the highly anticipated Joint Legislative Audit and Review Report on Best Practices for Virginia’s Lower Performing Schools can be considered (scheduled to be released June 2014).

Legislative Priority # 3: The City of Norfolk strongly supports legislative efforts to meaningfully address deficiencies in the current 1995 Public Private Transportation Act governing affected local governments. (Council Priorities: *Accessibility, Mobility, and Connectivity; Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Safe, Healthy, and Inclusive Community; and Well-Managed Government*).

There has been a dramatic increase in Virginia’s use of the Public Private Transportation Act of 1995 (PPTA) for construction projects. The PPTA was designed to leverage public sector transportation funding by attracting the private sector to risk capital and to bring its creativity and efficiency to the task of building the Commonwealth’s large transportation projects. While some evidence suggests that private sector creativity and efficiency can advance and improve the building of individual projects, there is little to no evidence to suggest that the private sector capital will be attracted to a significantly expanded pool of transportation revenues. Rather, PPTA projects have been funded almost entirely with either traditional transportation funds or municipal bond debt backed by tolls or other public tax sources that are then supplemented with traditional state and federal transportation revenues.

Evidence suggests that the PPTA process itself has evolved and grown substantially beyond its original intent and is now the “only process” for driving transportation policymaking decisions to an extent not originally envisioned. As available transportation construction dollars decline, transportation decision-making authority is ultimately shifting away from the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) to the PPTA proposer and the “responsible public entity” in charge of implementing the project. In point of fact, it is the CTB that is charged with the location, decision-making, and financing of transportation projects in Virginia. However, the CTB has no statutory role and only limited guidelines have been established for the CTB’s role in the PPTA process.

In the mid-1990’s the Secretary of Transportation was made Chairman of the CTB instead of the VDOT Commissioner for the purposing of “distancing” the line agencies from CTB policymakers. If the PPTA is going to be used as a method for soliciting ideas on whether or not to build a transportation project, the enabling statue should be changed to put more decision-making authority into the hands of policymakers instead of agency management staff.

The PPTA has evolved into a process in which large private-sector construction consortiums are proposing design/build/operate projects that primarily use taxpayer subsidized revenue bonds backed by high tolls, taxes, and then supplemented with whatever traditional government transportation revenues are available, including future federal revenue anticipation notes.

As a result, the PPTA process has accelerated projects of what some inside experts conclude to be “uncertain merit.” Over the course of the past several years when the PPTA process has been utilized, projects using “off-the-top” state funding have been given priority over other projects in the CTB’s six-year transportation plan. As a result, PPTA Projects that have not been through the “normal” transportation decision-making process and projects that have yet to achieve any semblance of consensus, have been approved and negotiated by VDOT. In some cases, a major PPTA project has been recommended before a full alternatives review has occurred under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, which appears to “bias” the outcome in favor of the PPTA proposal.

These actions undercut the intended role of the public’s input and the CTB’s recommendation authority as it relates to the funding and location of major transportation improvements. An honest assessment is that PPTA ideas are being solicited to assess a project’s viability before consensus has even been achieved on whether a project should be built.

These developments raise serious policy concerns for the City of Norfolk, which recently saw the result in the Midtown/Downtown/MLK PPTA project. Although public-private partnerships can be a useful tool, the PPTA statute and implementing guidelines need to be revised to address the current shortcomings that are increasingly becoming evident over the past 19 years since implementation.

The City therefore offers the following recommendations for improving the PPTA process:

1. Give the CTB a more direct statutory role in the PPTA process.

- a. Require any PPTA proposal to be part of the CTB six-year transportation plan before the PPTA Steering Committee reviews a preliminary proposal.
 - b. Require CTB approval for any PPTA Steering Committee recommendation before negotiating a Comprehensive Agreement.
 - c. Consider deleting from statute the Governor's ability to remove CTB Members before the expiration of their four-year term.
2. Provide more clarity in the PPTA statute and/or guidelines for considering a PPTA proposal before the NEPA process has concluded.
 - a. As condition of signing the PPTA Comprehensive Agreement, the CTB should have approved the project as a recommended NEPA alternative; or
 - b. Provide more clarity concerning what is being negotiated with a PPTA proposer before a NEPA recommendation is made to the CTB.
3. Require the PPTA proposer to invest a certain amount of equity in a toll project or buy a certain percentage of the bonds floated for a toll road project.
4. Require a minimum of at least two competing detailed proposals before moving forward on a PPTA selection.
 - a. It is impossible to accomplish a value analysis without competing proposals being examined for cost savings and efficiencies.
5. Require an independent verification of traffic and cost estimates for the impacted Metropolitan Planning Organization's verification.
6. Review and update VDOT design-build limitations to lessen the need for PPTA proposals.
7. Provide clearer guidance in statute on the use of non-compete clauses in any PPTA Comprehensive Agreements.
8. Include more of the PPTA process by statute rather than relying upon guidelines and interpretations that can be easily altered.
9. The public needs to know the contract terms and concessions that have been agreed to in a PPTA Comprehensive Agreement before it is signed.

Legislative Priority # 4: The City of Norfolk strongly supports legislation to require the Commonwealth to provide any deferred and on-going roadway maintenance on all future Public-Private Transportation Projects. (Council Priorities: *Accessibility, Mobility, and Connectivity; Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Safe, Healthy, and Inclusive Community; and Well-Managed Government*).

The Commonwealth has recently begun heavily utilizing the public-private partnership act to facilitate the financing, construction, and operation of significant transportation projects across the state. As part of contractual agreements that have been reached, the Commonwealth is requiring PPTA contractors to provide all, or nearly all, of the deferred and on-going roadway maintenance, which ultimately translates to higher toll rates being charged to citizens.

Fair and equitable treatment would require the Commonwealth to pay for the maintenance of PPTA transportation projects with funds collected for the Highway Maintenance & Operations Fund as it does for every other road project across the state. The revenue collected by the

Commonwealth and paid by Virginia citizens using these PPTA transportation facilities, is intended to be used to pay for statewide roadway maintenance.

The General Assembly is requested to consider prohibiting the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) from requiring toll revenue to pay for maintenance on public/private partnership projects going forward.

Legislative Priority # 5: The City of Norfolk supports legislative efforts to align the local Commonwealth Transportation Board appointments based upon established congressional districts as opposed to construction districts. (Council Priorities: *Accessibility, Mobility, and Connectivity; Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Safe, Healthy, and Inclusive Community; and Well-Managed Government*).

The Commonwealth Transportation Board is primarily comprised of members appointed from “construction districts” that were established in the 1920’s based on their geographic location. As presently designated, these construction districts reflect areas where VDOT once had centralized operations. However since the time of being established, the Commonwealth’s population has greatly shifted and coalesced primarily along I-95/I-64 corridor and the I-66/I-81 corridor. Currently, these construction districts and the representation on the Commonwealth Transportation Board do not correlate or even come close to the current population distribution across the Commonwealth—not counting economic activity considerations.

Virginia has a long held tradition of insisting upon representational democracy and the same should be true for how the Commonwealth determines its allocation of CTB appointments. Having the CTB representation aligned with congressional districts is the most equitable and fair methodology for determining CTB representation.

The General Assembly is therefore requested to amend the Code of Virginia so that each CTB member is selected from each congressional district while maintaining at-large members. For example, under the proposed scenario, Hampton Roads would include four CTB members representing the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Congressional Districts plus at-large members residing within Hampton Roads.

Legislative Priority # 6: The City of Norfolk supports the General Assembly requesting the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) to conduct an update to the JLARC Study # 64—*Equity of the Current Provisions for Allocating Highway and Transportation Funds in Virginia (Dec 1984)*. (Council Priorities: *Accessibility, Mobility, and Connectivity; Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Safe, Healthy, and Inclusive Community; and Well-Managed Government*).

Currently, the General Assembly authorizes the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) to allocate transportation trust funds (TTF) for construction after maintenance and other “off of

the top subtractions” (i.e. unpaved roads) are taken from the total transportation revenues available for a given year.

Of the remainder of transportation TTF dollars available, current law (COV Section 33.1-23) requires state highway construction funds to be allocated: 40% to the primary road system; 30% to the secondary system (funding determined 80% by population, 20% by land area); and 30% to the urban system (100% distributed by population). This allocation methodology was based upon the [JLARC Study # 64—The Equity of Current Provisions for Allocating Highway and Transportation Funds in Virginia \(Dec 1984\)](#).

At the time of the 1984 JLARC Study, rigorous investigation was accomplished to determine the current and forecasted needs of various Virginia transportation systems. JLARC recommended that the General Assembly distribute an equally divided 1/3 allocation of available transportation trust fund dollars to each transportation system. However, ultimately, the General Assembly opted to impose the 40-30-30 distribution that is currently employed to this day.

Considering the amount of time that has elapsed since the General Assembly last thoroughly reviewed its transportation funding allocation (30 years) and considering the new HB 2313 transportation funds available, the General Assembly is requested to undertake a similar JLARC Study as was completed in 1984.

Legislative Priority # 7: The City of Norfolk supports legislation to equitably distribute the apportionment of outstanding teacher retirement plan liability. (Council Priorities: *Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; and Well-Managed Government*).

As a result of new Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB), the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) must recognize its unfunded liabilities for the teacher retirement plans. These unfunded teacher retirement liabilities will first appear on local financial statements in FY 15 and will be based on VRS’s FY 14 valuation.

GASB requires that the unfunded liability must be apportioned among the participating employers that pay the retirement contributions to the pension plan. In Virginia, teachers are considered employees of the school board, which send retirement contributions to VRS. However, the Commonwealth, through the VA Department of Education, only reimburses the school boards based on the number of Standards of Quality-authorized positions and the locality’s composite index. Thus, the Commonwealth is actually not considered a direct payor and the outstanding teacher retirement costs will be apportioned among the school divisions by VRS based on each division’s percent of payroll.

Regardless of the fact teacher retirement contributions are funded by the state and school board, under the new GASB rules, the unfunded liability falls solely on the school boards. This means that each division’s liability will now be shown on each city, county, or town’s

financial statements as an unfunded liability. These liabilities will not be reflected on the Commonwealth's financial statements.

There are a number of reasons these unfunded teacher retirement liabilities should not be considered in determining local government bond ratings and creditworthiness:

1. The Commonwealth sets a minimum number of teachers and significantly shares in the costs of teacher salaries.
2. For more than 20 years, the Commonwealth has chosen to fund its teacher retirements plan at rates below those recommended by the VRS Board of Trustees.
3. Over the years, the Commonwealth has expanded retirement benefits by decreasing age and service requirements.
4. The General Assembly sets many of the retirement benefits, including requirements that retirement, group life insurance, and health insurance credits are offered.
5. Similar to teacher salaries, the unfunded teacher retirement liability should be a shared responsibility.

In summary, the consistent underfunding, benefit increases and investment losses are directly attributable to the magnitude of the current shortfall of the teacher retirement plan, which only has 60% of the assets needed to pay retirement liabilities. The unfunded liability associated with teacher retirement plans should be an equitably shared responsibility of both state and local government. The Norfolk City Council supports the General Assembly fully funding the actuarial rates of the Commonwealth's share of teacher retirement costs going forward.

Legislative Priority # 8: The City of Norfolk supports legislation to provide sufficient state funding for additional unfunded Family Access to Medical Insurance Security (FAMIS) administrative responsibilities. (Council Priorities: *Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Safe, Healthy and Inclusive Community; and Well-Managed Government*).

Currently, the FAMIS program has shared responsibilities between state and local governments. Local social service agency staff processes applicants who are eligible for Medicaid and the Commonwealth process applicants eligible for FAMIS.

However, effective October 1, 2013, applications for the FAMIS program will become the responsibility of local social service agencies. Effective December 31, 2013, the Commonwealth's central processing unit that has been responsible for processing FAMIS application will cease operations and become the responsibility of local agencies. No commiserate funding appropriation has been identified for these added processing responsibilities at the local level.

This unfunded shift in local in FAMIS administrative responsibilities comes at a time when local social service staffs are handling ever-increasing caseloads. Local agencies are already operating with significantly reduced state funding. This shift in FAMIS responsibilities will

require additional staff and increase operational costs at the local level and should be accompanied by sufficient state funding to offset the increase local government costs.

Legislative Priority # 9: The City of Norfolk requests the General Assembly to adjust the method by which members of the Transportation District Commission of Hampton Roads (TDCHR) are appointed so that the selection made by the Governor shall be made from the list of candidates prepared by each TDCHR member locality. (Council Priorities: *Accessibility, Mobility, and Connectivity; Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Safe, Healthy, and Inclusive Community; and Well-Managed Government*).

[HB 2504 \(Cosgrove\)](#) unanimously passed the 2011 General Assembly, was approved by the Governor, and became law July 1, 2011. Prior to HB 2504 becoming law, TDCHR Board appointments were made directly by TDCHR member local governments. Each TDCHR local government member appointed two council-members to TDCHR Board.

As introduced, HB 2504 (Cosgrove) allowed ex officio members to be appointed to TDCHR without any voting privileges, however, the bill was later amended to give “ex officio members,” including Governor appointments, voting privileges. Additionally, the clause requiring the Governor to select his/her TDCHR appointment from the list of three candidates provided by each locality was removed. After passage of HB 2504, Norfolk submitted three TDCHR Board candidates to the Governor for consideration and none were selected.

Considering the significant investment and priority of TDCHR’s success to Norfolk, the City Council supports the General Assembly adjusting the method by which TDCHR Board members are appointed so that the selection made by the Governor is made from the list of candidates prepared by each TDCHR member locality’s governing body.

Legislative Priority # 10: The City of Norfolk supports legislation to provide a local-option as to whether or not to restrict or curtail the use of plastic bags in their jurisdictions. (Council Priorities: *Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Environmental Sustainability; Safe, Healthy, and Inclusive Community; and Well-Managed Government*).

Plastic bags that are not buried in landfills are typically littered, windblown or recycled. Recycled plastic bags are valuable, but bulk recycling is difficult as the bags foul the recycling equipment. Generally, plastic bags are not biodegradable. Instead, littered bags break down into smaller toxic bits that contaminate soil and waterways, and enter into the food web when animals accidentally ingest those materials.

Stranded marine mammals including whales, dolphins and sea turtles have been found with plastic debris in their digestive systems, and entangled in the bags. Farmers have voiced major concerns about littered plastic bags because they can get caught in cotton stalks and contaminate cotton crops. In urban areas, they clog storm sewer outfalls, block sunlight from critical shoreline habitat and litter shorelines, parks and other public and private areas.

Using plastic bags provides retailers effectiveness, efficiency and convenience in delivering their products to consumers. However, improper disposal of plastic bags is widespread and they are a significant source of pollution. Local governments nationwide have considered voluntary recycling efforts and other strategies to reduce plastic bag waste and litter. Some are turning to plastic bag bans, taxes and other incentives to reduce the use of these bags and subsequent littering.

In this regard, Virginia local governments should be authorized to decide for themselves which solutions and programs they wish to explore for meaningfully addressing plastic bag litter.

2014 Virginia General Assembly Recommended State Budgeting Principals

As it relates to state budgeting and considering the significant economic downturn, the Norfolk City Council respectfully requests that the Governor and General Assembly not:

1. Further restrict local revenue authority or sources without providing alternative revenue authority and sustainable revenue sources. This includes BPOL and M&T taxes.
2. Confiscate or re-direct local general funds and special funds to the state treasury.
3. Impose new funding requirements or expand existing ones on services delivered by local governments.
4. Shift state funding responsibilities onto local governments, including law enforcement and public safety activities.
5. Impose state fees, taxes or surcharges on local government services.
6. Place additional administrative burdens on local governments.

The City Council further respectfully requests the Governor and the General Assembly begin efforts to accomplish the following necessary state budgeting tasks:

1. Immediately examine all state requirements and service expansions to determine those that can be suspended or modified to alleviate some of the financial burden on state and local taxpayers.
2. Develop and regularly communicate state spending and revenue priorities of the Commonwealth.
3. After all other actions have been taken to eliminate those state programs determined to be unnecessary, the state should consider strategies for the state's full funding to adequately meet its constitutional and statutory obligations.
4. Local government representatives should be included on any "blue ribbon" commission or other body established by the Commonwealth for the purpose of making recommendations for changes to local revenue authority or governance.

Appendix 1:

Norfolk Public School 2014 Legislative Priorities

2013-2014
Legislative Priorities
By the School Board of the City of Norfolk

Norfolk Public Schools support the following:

1. Directing the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission to undertake a comprehensive review of the funding of the Standards of Quality.
2. Restoring state funding reductions that have been imposed over the past several years.
3. Allowing local school boards to set the school calendar for their division, including opening prior to Labor Day, without having to request a waiver.
4. Establishing a balanced assessment and accountability system, as defined by local school boards, that utilizes a more complete picture of student learning by [providing both measures of achievement (such as the Standards of Learning (SOL) tests) and state-approved, authentic measures of individualized student growth over time.
5. Reducing the number of SOL tests to carefully selected grade-levels and content-areas to permit the reallocation of assessment dollars and instructional time.
6. Local School Division control of SOL testing windows. Local school boards should have the flexibility to provide opportunities for early SOL test administrations; to allow for retaking of tests not passed during the same school year; and to assess students based on mastery of course content and not solely upon reaching a particular number or instructional clock hours.
7. Repealing the statewide A-F grading system and remove all language creating and requiring such system for individual schools.
8. The control of schools to the local school boards and repeal the Opportunity Educational Institution and all language creating and authorizing this Institution.

Norfolk Public schools oppose the following:

1. Allowing non-public school students to participate in the Virginia High School League (VHSL) activities.
2. Vouchers or tuition tax-credits for non-public schools.
3. Unfunded local mandates and programs without the state share of funding.

Appendix 2:

Contact Information for
Norfolk's Local, State, and Federal Elected Officials

Norfolk City Council Contact Information

<p>Paul D. Fraim, Mayor / At Large 1001 City Hall Building 810 Union Street Norfolk, VA 23510</p> <p>757-664-4679 paul.fraim@norfolk.gov</p>	<p>Anthony L. Burfoot, Vice Mayor / Ward 3 1006 City Hall Building 810 Union Street Norfolk, VA 23510</p> <p>757-664-4709 anthony.burfoot@norfolk.gov</p>
<p>Andrew A. Protopgyrou, Ward 1 1006 City Hall Building 810 Union Street Norfolk, VA 23510</p> <p>757-625-1775 andrew.protopgyrou@norfolk.gov</p>	<p>Paul R. Riddick, Ward 4 1006 City Hall Building 810 Union Street Norfolk, VA 23510</p> <p>757-855-9010 paul.riddick@norfolk.gov</p>
<p>Thomas R. Smigiel, Ward 5 1006 City Hall Building 810 Union Street Norfolk, VA 23510</p> <p>757-531-7595 thomas.smigiel@norfolk.gov</p>	<p>Theresa W. Whibley, MD, Ward 2 1006 City Hall Building 810 Union Street Norfolk, VA 23510</p> <p>757-623-3845 terry.whibley@norfolk.gov</p>
<p>Angelia A. Williams, Super Ward 7 1006 City Hall Building 810 Union Street Norfolk, VA 23510</p> <p>757-419-8183 angelia.williams@norfolk.gov</p>	<p>Barclay C. Winn, Super Ward 6 1006 City Hall Building 810 Union Street Norfolk, VA 23510</p> <p>757-494-1400 barclay.winn@norfolk.gov</p>

Norfolk General Assembly Delegation Contact Information

<p>Senator Kenneth C. Alexander (D-5th) 120 West Berkley Avenue Norfolk, VA 23523</p> <p>757-223-1333 (District Office) 804-698-7505 (Richmond Office) district05@senate.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Senator Ralph Northam (D-6th) P.O. Box 9636 Norfolk, VA 23505</p> <p>757-818-5172 (District Office) 804-698-7506 (Richmond Office) district06@senate.virginia.gov</p>
<p>Senator Frank Wagner (R-7th) P.O. Box 68008 Virginia Beach, VA 23471</p> <p>757-671-2250 (District Office) 804-698-7507 (Richmond Office) district07@senate.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Delegate Johnny Joannou (D-79th) 709 Court Street Portsmouth, VA 23704</p> <p>757-399-1700 (District Office) 804-698-1079 (Richmond Office) DelJJoannou@house.virginia.gov</p>
<p>Delegate Matthew James (D-80th) P.O. Box 7487 Portsmouth, VA 23707</p> <p>757-967-7583 (District Office) 804-698-1080 (Richmond Office) DelMJJames@house.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Delegate Chris Stolle (R-83rd) P.O. Box 5429 Virginia Beach, VA 23471</p> <p>757-633-2080 (District Office) 804-698-1083 (Richmond Office) DelCStolle@house.virginia.gov</p>
<p>Delegate Daun Hester (D-89th) 1751 Church Street Norfolk, VA 23504</p> <p>757-625-8989 (District Office) 804-698-1089 (Richmond Office) DelDHester@house.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Delegate Algie T. Howell (D-90th) P.O. Box 12865 Norfolk, VA 23541</p> <p>757-466-7525 (District Office) 804-698-1090 (Richmond Office) DelAHowell@house.virginia.gov</p>
<p>Delegate Lynwood W. Lewis (D-100th) P.O. Box 760 Accomac, VA 23301</p> <p>757-787-1094 (District Office) 804-698-6700 (Richmond Office) DelLLewis@house.virginia.gov</p>	

Norfolk Congressional Delegation Contact Information

<p>The Honorable Mark R. Warner (D-VA) United States Senate 459A Russell Senate Office Building Washington, DC 20510</p> <p>202-224-2023 (Office)</p>	<p>The Honorable Tim Kaine (D-VA) United States Senate 388 Russell Senate Office Building Washington, DC 20510</p> <p>202-224-4024 (Office)</p>
<p>The Honorable Scott Rigell (R- VA 2nd) United States House of Representatives 327 Cannon House Office Building Washington, DC 20515</p> <p>202-225-4215 (Office)</p>	<p>The Honorable Robert C. Scott (D-VA 3rd) United States House of Representatives 1201 Longworth House Office Building Washington, DC 20515</p> <p>202-225-8351 (Office)</p>
<p>Link to US House of Representatives Website: http://www.house.gov/</p> <p>Link to US Senate Website: http://www.senate.gov/</p>	